

## REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 are rejected.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,905,295 to Prall et al. in view of US Patent No. 6,355,968 to Lehmann et al.

Claims 1, 5 and 10 require that the connecting lines are partially in the fusing region and then are bent in a first, second or third direction, depending upon the connecting lines. The combination of references does not teach connecting lines so arranged. As stated in the office action, Prall, et al., “differ from the claimed invention by not showing a first connecting line region partially in the first laser fusing region which is disposed to be bent in a second direction; a second connecting line region which is disposed to be bent in a third direction; a third connecting line region which is disposed to be bent in the second region; and a fourth connection line region...”

The office action states that Lehman, et al. ‘teach conductive lines pass on the same level of the fuses.’ However, the conductive lines of Lehman are not bent. As can be seen in Figures 6 and 7 and corresponding text at column 4, lines 56 through column 7, line 11, the conductive lines of Lehman are straight and run parallel the fuse array in straight lines in their entirety. See Figure 6, fuse array 106 and conductive lines 208 and Figure 7, fuse array 106 and lines 202.

As claims 1, 5 and 10 require that the connecting lines be bent, to more closely pack the fuses while maintaining the necessary distances for operation, and the combination of references does not show, teach nor suggest this, it is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 16-17 and 19-20 depend from claims 1, 5, 10, 15 and 18 respectively, and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. For example, claims 2, 6 and 11 require that the laser fusing region have a parallelogram shape. The office action

states that the combination of references teaches this, but it is not believe that this is true. The fusing region that would be taught by the combination of references is not a parallelogram, and the shape of the fusing region is not combined with any connecting lines that are bent in any manner, much less in three different directions. It is therefore submitted that claims 2, 6 and 11 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

With regard to claims 3, 7 and 12, there in no indication in either reference or the combination thereof of the connecting lines being bent in any direction, much less in first, second and third directions, where the first direction is perpendicular to the second and third direction. It is therefore submitted that claims 3, 7 and 12 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Similarly with regard to claims 4, 8 and 13, the combination of references does not teach that there are first, second and third directions, much less that the first direction is perpendicular to the second and third, or that the second and third directions are opposite each other.

With regard to claims 9 and 14, the combination of references does not teach that the fuses arranged as in claims 5 and 10 are disposed repeatedly. It is therefore submitted that claims 5 and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 15 and 18 require the connecting lines to connect to both the first and second end of the fuse regions. As stated in the office action, Prall, et al., do not teach this. Lehman does not teach how the conductive lines are connected to the fuses, just that conductive lines exist. There is no suggestion as to how the conductive lines are connected to the fuse array and it is improper use of hindsight to read the connections at either end into the prior art.

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 15 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 16-17 and 19-20 depend from claims 15 and 18, respectively, and should be ruled allowable for that reason and for their own merits. It is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 20575**

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
503-222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment; Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Date: September 2, 2004

Angie C. Seer  
Angie C. Seer